
From: Barr, James (FTA)
To: fmiyamoto@co.honolulu.hi.us
CC: Matley, Ted (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA)
Sent: 10/6/2009 4:56:24 AM
Subject: FW: Honolulu Rail Project Section 106 PA

Faith:
I would like to echo what Ted said about the "...changes to the Project alignment..." line. This is too proscriptive for us. Moving the alignment should be one of the last options not one of the first. Moreover, this stipulation is posed under the OIBC and Lineal and Cultural Consultation paragraph. Why would we give OIBC veto power when we wouldn't let them be signatories?
There are two lines in there referring to NAGPRA. One is in the stipulations. They say "crossing land administered by the Federal government..." "Administered" should be changed to "controlled or owned" in line with actual NAGPRA language.
Finally, please include signature lines for all Concurring Parties. If they sign fine. If they don't, that's OK too.
Thank you;
Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 12:50 PM
To: Miyamoto, Faith
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Barr, James (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu Rail Project Section 106 PA

Faith,

We understand the scheduling difficulties, but feel it would be a rather abrupt ending to not have one last close out meeting of the group to review any last concerns and allow for final statements. So schedule as soon as you reasonably can one last meeting and advertise it as the final wrap up. You have made good progress in a very difficult situation; let's not jeopardize that by what may seem as a premature closure of group discussion.

Also, we are assuming the conclusions of the burial task force are included in this draft PA of 10/2. We are concerned by the following text regarding changing the alignment in that section:

"In the event that no other option is identified, changes to Project alignment would be evaluated to avoid the disturbance of iwi kupuna."

Can you explain how that would work? Is the City really going to consider moving the whole project, with all the resulting complications?

Also, we have read the statement of Edward Halealoha Ayau, of Hi Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei, regarding the need for a full AIS or the movement of the project alignment, and do not agree with his conclusions. As a concurring party he will be free to sign the PA or not.

Ted

-----Original Message-----

From: Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2009 6:09 PM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: Honolulu Rail Project Section 106 PA

Hi Ted -

I would like to speak with you regarding the next steps for the Section 106 PA. Should I schedule another meeting of the consulting parties? Or are the signatories comfortable that enough consultation has occurred? Can FTA discuss the comfort level with ACHP and SHPD? I am concerned that Blythe will be out of the office from this Thursday to October 19th. If we need

AR00125722

to wait until she gets back, this will cause quite a delay for us.

I am available tomorrow morning and early afternoon. On Tuesday, I will be out of the office until about 10:00 a.m.

Hope we can discuss soon.

Faith.